

REMARKS

The independent claims have been amended in a sincere attempt to patentably define the claimed invention from the newly cited art. More particularly, the independent claims have been changed to specify that there is created on the ribs (and where appropriate the dielectric layer) that have no phosphor layer and that correspond to the regions between adjacent display electrode pairs. This embodiment is discussed in the application at page 11, lines 17 to 20 and others. Enclosed also for the Examiner's review are highlighted copies of the drawings showing areas where these regions have been formed. The change is to make more explicit that which is recited in the claims already, namely that the phosphor layers "extend intermittently." The claims now call for "no phosphor layer" as well.

The rejection of claims 1 to 3, 9, and 10 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Sano et al. '264 in view of Anderson et al. '946, if applied to the amended claims, is respectfully traversed. The Examiner has cited Anderson et al. '946 merely to show that it is known to cover electrode with a dielectric layer and relies upon Sano et al. '264 for all other elements of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree

that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been directed to the present invention from a joint consideration of these references.

Sano et al. '264 discloses a plasma display panel with phosphor layers on the ribs but the phosphor layer formation does not leave regions on those ribs or the dielectric layer that have no phosphor layer and that correspond to the regions between the adjacent display electrode pairs. Indeed, the Sano et al. '264 ribs are displayed in a matrix matter as is believed clearly shown by the reference drawings such as Figs. 4 and 8. There is no teaching or suggestion in either Sano et al. '264 or Anderson et al. '946 to create the arrangement claimed herein and the rejection should be withdrawn.

While applicants note with appreciation the detailed explanation in support of the rejection, it is believed that the claims as amended define patentably and clearly over the references.

The rejection of claims 4 to 8 and 11 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Sano et al. '264 in view of Anderson et al. '946 and Mizobata '600, if applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed as well.

Serial No. 09/287,190

The tertiary reference is cited to show it is known to use a light-adsorbing layer containing a dark pigment and a dielectric. The reference, however, does not provide that which is lacking from the other two references as discussed above, and the rejection should be withdrawn as well.

Applicants respectfully submit that the case is now in immediate condition for allowance and a USPTO paper to those ends is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner again is authorized to cancel non-elected claim 12 should that be the only barrier to allowance. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if other changes are required in the case before allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.


Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

February 5, 2004
Date

CAW/ch

Enclosure:

Highlighted original drawings
Attorney Docket No.: DAIN:496

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street
Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220